DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 465 CS 200 336

AUTHOR	Meade, Richard; And Others
TITLE	[Behavioral Objectives in English.]
INSTITUTION	Virginia Association of Teachers of English.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	23p.
JOURNAL CIT	Virginia English Bulletin; v20 n3 p3-19, 24-27 Winter 1970
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Affective Objectives; *Behavioral Objectives; *Cognitive Objectives; Communication Skills; *Educational Accountability; Elementary Education; *English; English Curriculum; School Responsibility; Secondary Education; Student Behavior

ABSTRACT

This edition of the "Virginia English Bulletin" is devoted primarily to articles about behavioral objectives and the teaching of English. In "Behavioral Objectives for English?" Richard A. Meade argues that these objectives ought to include the acquisition not only of skills and knowledge but also of understandings, insights, and feelings. He also asserts that exact measurement of insights is not possible. Robert W. Reising, in "The Affective Fallacy: More on Behavioral Objectives and the Teaching of English," argues that these objectives do not have to exclude the affective domain and that English teachers should not let others construct their behavioral objectives. In "Backlash or Backwash?" Robert T. Robertson argues that the movement for creating these objectives in English is inherently mechanistic, simplistic, and reactionary, and that it should be resisted by the humanistic teacher. Robert P. Hilldrup, in "Accountability for Achievement in English," argues that English teachers should be accountable for certain objective skills they can transmit, but that their overall objective is teaching communications, an achievement which is difficult to measure. (DI)

ED 073465

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VIRGINIA ENGLISH BULLETIN

Volume XX, Number 3

Winter 1970

[Behavioral Objectives in English]

CS 200 336

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
Virginia Association
of Teachers of English
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Within the past year a widespread and growing movement called "behavioral objectives" or "accountability" has become a major concern of schools throughout the country. In a recent Gallups poll, reported in the Phi Delta Kappan for October, 1970, this question was asked, "Would you favor or oppose a system that would hold teachers more accountable for the progress of students?" The results showed 21% opposed, 67% favored, and 12% gave no opinion. Several articles giving different viewpoints of this controversial topic appear in this new, expanded issue of the "Bulletin."

Behavioral Objectives for English?

Richard A. Meade

Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

There has been much talk recently about behavioral objectives, so much in fact that at the 1970 convention the National Council of Teachers of English passed a resolution to warn teachers of English that they should keep a weather eye open in regard to them. Such objectives have two key characteristics, one basic and the other subsidiary. A behavioral objective is so designated because it must disclose the behavior which a learner should exhibit visibly for the objective to be met. The subsidiary characteristic is that each objective must be susceptible of being measured to determine attainment by the learner. The classroom learner does whatever a teacher requires to accomplish an objective; he can then be tested to discover whether he has, in fact, acquired the desired learning. In a much quoted reference, *Instructional Objectives*, Robert F. Mager gives the following illustrations as meeting the major requirements:[1]

1. The student is to be able to complete a 100 item multiple-choice examination on the subject of marine biology. The lower limit of acceptable performance will be 85 items answered correctly within an examination period of 90 minutes.

2. The student must be able to correctly (sic) name each item depicted by each of a series of 20 blueprints.

Dr. Richard Meade, a member of the VATE Executive Committee and NCTE Liaison Officer, gave the address reprinted here at the banquet meeting of VATE's Fifth Annual Supervisory Conference. Several contributions refer to this address in their articles. Dr. Meade, a past president of VATE sponsors the University of Virginia Annual Language Arts Conference scheduled this spring for Saturday, April 17.

3. The student is to be able to draw his service revolver and fire five rounds (shots) from the hip within a period of three seconds. At 25 yards all rounds must hit the standard silhouette target; at 50 yards he must hit with at least two of his five rounds.
4. The student is to be able to name and give an example of each of six programming techniques useful for eliciting a correct response. To be considered correct, items listed by the student must appear on the handout entitled "Programming Techniques" issued by the instructor during the course.

Most talk at the present time about behavioral objectives comes from either designers of programmed materials for instruction or users of systems analysis, or both.. Jerome P. Lysaught and Clarence M. Williams, in *A Guide to Programmed Instruction*, say behavioral objectives are essential to programming and describe them in detail.[2] The systems analysis expert seems to have obtained his techniques from industrial and/or computerized operations which must have concrete objectives, which must engage in some process to work toward these objectives, and which must have clear-cut means of determining their realization — presumably within a relatively short space of time.

On the positive side, behavioral objectives conceived in either of these sources may possibly have a salutary effect upon the English classroom. Any teacher should possess a clear idea of his instructional objectives, an idea of what he expects pupils to achieve other than the covering of pages in a textbook. If some teachers lack clear objectives, the behavioral objectives idea may call to their attention the need for and the use of objectives. Still educators have long held the teaching act to consist of (1) objectives, (2) learning experiences designed to achieve them, and (3) measurement (where possible) to discover the presence or absence of the expected learnings. The present behavioral objectives enthusiasts are in the position of the Pharoah mentioned in Exodus: "There arose up a new king over Egypt, who knew not Joseph." Those who must borrow systems analysis from business management evidently have never read the educational writings which proclaimed a comparable system. A. R. Palmer in 1929 described his "learning-product technique."[3] He identified the first practice in this technique as "the setting up of learning products in terms of new ways of behaving to be attained by pupils." "The second practice," he continued, "is providing the learning activities and learning material that will produce the desired learning produce." Note that he defined his "learning product" as "a new way of behaving." He pointed out, too, that a test would "secure evidence from which one (might) infer the presence or absence of the learning product." It makes little practical difference whether a teacher becomes aware of the need for objectives and for associated learning experiences from A. R. Palmer, from educational writers since 1929, or from a "systems man."

There are two main objections, however, to the new breed objectives. The first is that they do not appear to include certain major types of learnings. In his *Instructional Objectives*, Robert F. Mager acknowledges this omission by saying this book is "for any-

one interested in transmitting skills and knowledge to others."[4] Mager's behavioral objectives do suit well skill-type objectives, which depict a kind of behavior that is readily observable. The abiliity to place a comma in a series of words is a clear example; the teacher can look at a written sentence and observe the presence or absence of the comma. Mager shows by the various examples listed above that to him knowledge means repeating bits of information. Nowhere does he suggest that knowledge-type objectives include generalizations, understanding, concepts, or the kind of learnings termed insights. Yet A. R. Palmer in 1929 designated one kind of "learning-product" as *understanding*. He said that this type differed from the ability-, or skill-, type "in being, not a fixed and automatic response, but a method of thinking that leads a "generalization. Such a learning product," he continued, "Implies not mere memorization but the development of an intelligent attitude based upon a transformation of meaning. The pupil is now able to associate new ideas with other knowledge and to be conscious of their relatinship.' As recently as 1960, Jerome Bruner, in his *Process of Education*, spoke of the structure of a subject as consisting in part of major ideas essentially the same kind of learning.[5]

Palmer considered the acquisition of an understanding as a new way of behaving. Was he correct to consider mental transformation as a kind of behavior? The possession of a new insight, or of a greater depth of insight, may be just as much a behavior as placing a period at the end of a sentence or repeating the titles of Shakespeare's tragedies. In addition, an attitude may be based on an insight, albeit it may be absorbed from association. Both insights and attitudes appear to be omitted from current treatments of behavioral objectives.

When John Ciardi said that readers should discover through literature "glimmerings about what it means to be a human being on this titled planet" and when Wallace Stevens said, "the function of a poet is to help men live their lives," they were talking about the acquisition of insights — insights into the human condition. The reader of Frost's "Stopping by Woods" gains insight into the understanding that tension exists between the call of duty and the desire for pleasure. The reader of Robinson's "Richard Cory" gains insight into the understanding that one man may not know what is bothering another man. The reader of Byron's "Prisoner of Chillon" gains insight into the understanding that man over the years has held dear his freedom and has gone to insufferable ends to defend it. Such insights man gains only from his own real experiences or from vicarious experiences through works of art, like literary pieces.

Insights like these — the main stuff of literature teaching — may have been intentionally overlooked by systems experts, because insights defy experts because of the second main objection to the kind of objectives generally called behavioral; i.e., exact measurement. Yet there is real doubt as to whether exact measurement is possible the obligation to word them in such a way as to state each insight clearly.

When a teacher accepts insights as objectives, he should accept as to whether exact measurement is possible. A learner might even feign insight without really possessing any. As already mentioned, Laysaught and Williams, among others, have mentioned the necessity of concrete behavioral objectives for programmed instruction. They present a table to show their derivation of behavioral objectives from what they call more abstract objectives.[6] In this table their first statement of an objective appears at a glance to be an understanding, although the authors do not indicate a type. The wording is "to acquire a basic understanding of earth-sun relationships." This wording is faulty for stating an understanding: — an insight: in fact, as William C. Burton once wrote in his explanation of the statement of objectives for the insight — (or understanding-) type, such as expression as "an understanding of earth-sun relationships" tells *where* the understanding is but not what it is.[7] A true understanding, properly worded, is this: The sun is the source of all energy on earth. A sub-insight to this one is: Chlorophyll in in green plants, which supplies their energy, is dependent upon sunlight to be manufactured. An insight must be so stated as to tell what the understanding in question is. The trouble with "an understanding of earth-sun relationships" is that it is a noun construction which does not "say anything." There is no statement in "an understading of earth-sun relationship."

With regard to the sample insight-type objectives suggested earlier for three poems, here are "right" and "wrong" ways to state them:

Wrong	*Right*
The understanding of man's reaction to duty and pleasure	The understanding that man experiences tension as he decides whether to do his duty or give in to his desires for pleasure
The understanding of Richard Cory's plight	The understanding that in their thoughts about Richard Cory the people on the street show that they did not understand the inner problems of Cory and thus suggest that one man may not know the problems of another
The understanding of man's relationship to freedom	The understanding that man has undergone enormous difficulties in his struggle for freedom

There is no intention here to suggest how a teacher may have a student acquire these stated insights. There is no implication, for example, that they need be told to a class. Teaching for insights might well follow a discovery or inquiry method. But how to teach for such objectives is not the province of this discussion.

Modern explanations of behavioral objectives also omit any reference to aesthetic or other appreciation-type matters. Attention has been called to this lack in a number of writings. Robert Hogan emphasizes this point in his article in a new publication of the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English *On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English*.[8] Hogan believes that feelings may play a significant part in the lives of human beings. English teachers may well be concerned about the feelings of their students, specially for reading and literature. Feelings may also be closely associated with insights. For example, feelings came into play in one classroom some years ago when World War II was in progress at a time just after news reports had announced that Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill had proclaimed to the world their famous four freedoms. The literature book had the *Prisoner of Chillon* under the caption "Famous Narrative Poems." It had been the teacher's custom to approach these poems in just that way. Pupils were supposed to read the *Prisoner of Chillon* and like it because George Gordon, Lord Byron wrote it and because it was famous as a work of literary art. On the particular day in question he suddenly saw that he should talk with the class about the four freedoms, since the main character of Byron's poem underwent so much for freedom. After having a conversation with the class about what feedom has meant to man and about the freedoms that American men were then fighting for, the teacher read the *Prisoner of Chillon* aloud with a minimum of necessary explanation.

As the reading ended, the bell rang, a lucky happening for the teacher. Pupils in that class had brothers on the battlefields at the moment: they had become so involved in the subject matter of the poem that the classroom atmosphere was heavy with emotion. Many of them left with lumps in their throats. A major question is this: How does a teacher measure such a lump?[9]

Again most recent treatments of behavioral objectives emphasize skill-type learnings, including the memorization of bits of information. These are the matters that schools have long overemphasized, sometimes to the neglect of insights and affective concerns. If an English teacher should pay allegiance to behavioral objectives of this kind, he is likely to continue to emphasize skills and memorization of bits of information and to omit from his teaching all direction toward insights and feelings. He would do so only at the peril of ignoring a major portion of true education in English.

REFERENCES

[1] Mager, Robert F., *Instructional Objectives*, Palo Alto: Fearon Publishers 1962, pp. 56, 57.

[2] Lysaught, Jerome P., and Williams, Clarence M., *A Guide to Programmed Instruction*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963, pp. 52

[3] Palmer, A. R., *Progressive Practices in Directing Learning*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929, p. 48.

[4] Mager, Robert F., *op. cit.*,

[5] Bruner, Jerome, *The Process of Education*, Cambridge: Harvard

[6] Lysaugh and Williams, *op. cit.* p. 56

[7] Burton, William H., *The Guidance of Learning Activities*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952, p. 420.

[8] Maxwell, John, and Anthony Tovatt, editors, Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, pp. 125-129.

[9] See J. N. Hook's question about the measuring of "a gleam in the eye" in Maxwell and Tovatt, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-85.

The Affective Fallacy: More on Behavioral Objectives and the Teaching of English

Dr. R. W. Reising

Associate Professor of Secondary Education
Virginia Cmomonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia

Not since Mrs. O'Leary's cow kicked over the lantern has there been such heat. Behavioral objectives in English? "Don't make a monkey out of me. I refuse to get on your bicycle,"[1] explodes Hans P. Guth. Behavioral objectives in English? "There are real dangers to the English Curriculum possible,"[2] caution John Maxwell and Anthony Tovatt. Behavioral objectives in English? "If need be . . . fight for the retention of important humanistic goals of education,"[3] urges NCTE. Behavioral objectives in English? "We are being MacNamara-ed, and we should fight it,"[4] proclaims James Moffett.

Yet I refuse to get heated over it. Perhaps because I have recently worked in Florida, where air conditioning and behavioral objectives are a way of life, I prefer to keep my "cool". I simply believe that we who are involved with English should view "B.O.'s" as an opportunity to examine and illuminate our discipline and our responsibilities to it. They just may prove, if we choose to get close enough to them, to be friends rather than foes. I suspect that they will solve few of our problems, mind you, but I am willing to give them a chance.

My relatively charitable position results, too, from my belief that the coming of "B.O.'s," or of some other measurement devices, was predictable and that, consequently, we could have prepared for them had we wished. The call that U. S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel made in 1963 for a nationwide study "to determine the progress of education"[5] was a sure sign. Assessment is, to my way of thinking, a perfect prelude to and foundation for accountability, that which is demanded today under the guise of "B.O.'s." In fact, some of the questions posed in the last decade by the assessment people—for instance, "How does a given discipline assess, and for what does it assess?"—bear an uncanny resemblance to questions currently being raised by accountability enthusiasts. Yet none in our ranks violently opposed the call for assessments. Similarly, none worked at developing assessment instruments, which, given the present heat over "B.O.'s," might well have served as a substitute for them—or at least as a base from which to evolve an acceptable substitute.

But other omens also harbingered the arrival of "B.O.'s." The tremendous mushrooming in public school costs, from 17 billion dollars in 1960-61 to 40.7 billion dollars in 1970-71,[6] represented one of them. With dramatic increases in financial outlays an annual occurrence, surely one question was destined to be asked eventually of all teachers, those in English included: "Can you prove that the money going to you for instructional purposes is being used efficiently?" The request for the manufacture of "B.O.'s" is simply that question rephrased.

Likewise, the fact that "each year the ranks of the school dropouts increase by three quarters of a million young men and women"[4] foretold that "B.O.'s," or some other accountability instruments, were in the offing for our discipline, as well as for every other. Somebody, or a bunch of somebodies, was bound to query us one day about the effectiveness of our instruction in light of the radical annual growth of those ranks. Similarly, the recent and scathing indictments of all public education, carrying such no-holds-barred titles as *The Tyranny of Education*, *Our Children Are Dying*, and *Teaching As A Subversive Activity*, the last-named by two persons in English Education no less, were intimations that the day, or the decade, of accountability was soon to arrive. The launching of the Carnegie Corporation study in 1966 provided still another omen. The findings of that study, completed in the fall of 1970, supply virtually irrefutable proof that the "severest critics of present American education" were right, that schools are "oppressive," "grim," and "joyless," and that teachers "fail to think seriously about the purposes and consequences of what they do—about the relationship of educational means to ends—and that they seldom question established practice," tending "to do what teachers before them have done."[5]

Dr. Reising, a new contributor to the Bulletin, joined the staff of Virginia Commonwealth University this fall as Associate Professor in the Department of Secondary Education. Prior to that time he had taught for fourteen years at a variety of institutions, among them the University of Florida, a state where behavioral objectives have been established. Last summer Dr. Reising received the doctorate in English Education from Duke University having previously received a B.A. from Michigan State and an M.A. from the University of Connecticut.

He has authorized numerous magazine articles as well as a high school text book, Literature and Sports.

We who are involved with English would like to think that the findings of the Carnegie study, like the accusations of the public school critics, apply only to our neighbors in other disciplines, not to us. But in our honest minds we know otherwise. We know, for instance, that we have been equally guilty of failing to reconcile research findings with classroom practices and that, as a consequence, we still find many, perhaps thousands, in our ranks cherising anachronistic methodology—hoping, praying, and actually believing that it is as modern as it was when Mrs. O'Leary's cow was a calf. Most typical, perhaps, are those among us who cling steadfastly to the practice of imposing the formal study of grammar upon students as a means of improving their writing—this is the face of contradictory evidence that is as mountainous as it is convincing. Small wonder, then, that, under under the guise of striving to alert "the new teacher who is anxious to get started right," the *English Journal* (September, 1970, p. 854) warns us for the umpteenth time that the practice, like nine other equally ineffective ones, "'should not be' in the English classroom." Small wonder, too, that in "The Linguistic Imagination" (*English Journal*, April, 1970, pp. 477 ff.), originally presented at

the 1969 NCTE National Convention, James E. Miller, President of NCTE, employs the label "*la trivia grammatical*" to identify one of the images of the English teacher.

Thus, for two reasons at least, the conflagration over "B.O.'s" does not enkindle my passions. As Robert F. Hogan might have said (but obviously did not intend to say) in "On Hunting and Fishing and Behaviorism," while we who are involved with English were off fishing, others spent their time hunting—and they trapped some big game, on which they placed the label "behavioral objectives." Now they have invited us to share in the examination of them, and I for one am not about to be inhospitable, especially since at the moment I have no replacement on which to focus my attention and, equally important, I just may profit from the study. The jargon of my hosts, terms like 'program variable," "descriptive variable," and "minimum level variable," does not really appeal to me, but being linguistically tolerant, I am certain that I can accept it. Likewise, although I find some of their thinking strange—for instance, their belief that the results of human learning are always discernible and measurable, I am not about to be scared off by it, for I know that I share their interest in behaviors: as Alan C. Purves points out, "behaviors . . . are the business of all of us in education."[9] Anyway, because hunters are traditionally more robust than fishermen, I am eager to learn something about the reasons for and sources of their robustness.

Knowing that many others from English are equally curious, I would like to outline several suggestions that may prove valuable to us as we pursue the study. I think all of these suggestions sensible inasmuch as I have had ample opportunity, thanks to my days in Florida, to work with "B.O.'s" and some of their most capable proponents. A look at a few negative suggestions that possess a potential for positive results is appropriate at the outset:

One: Even if we teach in states in which there is apparently little interest in "B.O.'s," we *should not* take an "It can't happen here" attitude. It can prepare us for just one result: a rude awakening. For a long time teachers in Florida, for example, held such an attitude—only to learn recently that their State Department of Education demanded that all of them participate in the manufacture of "B.O.'s." As a former colleague of mine states in a syllabus which he prepared for a course offered through the College of Education at the University of South Florida, "Whether one accepts heartily or rejects vehemently the idea of stating learning objectives in behavioral terms as prescribed by the accreditation standard guidelines (Florida), the fact remains that this is currently the policy."[10] Essentially, every teacher in every public school of Florida is "asked to do three things," according to Harold H. Blanton, Consultant on School Accreditation for the State Department of Education—and the format of his recent letter to me suggests the priorities which he wishes to make clear:

(1) State specifically what she expects her students to learn in a unit of time.

(2) Outline the conditions under which they will be working—

AND

(3) State specifically how success will be measured.[11] Undeniably, in the current decade none involved with English not even Miller's *la trivia grammatical*, has justification for being caught off guard should he be asked to participate in the manufacture of "B.O.'s." States like Florida signal what is possible. Thus our motto should be not "It can't happen here" but "Since it has happened elsewhere, it can happen anywhere."

Two: We *should not* attack Robert F. Mager's *Preparing Instructional Objectives* (palo Alto: Fearon Publishers, Inc., 1962) unless we understand exactly what that book represents. It is unfair, for instance, to indict that volume and its author on the grounds that "nowhere does he [Mager] suggest that knowledge-type objectives include generalizations (insights, concepts, understandings)."[12] In *P.I.O.*, Mager is by his own admission not interested in discussing the applicability of "B.O.'s" to the affective domain, the domain in which insights prominently figure and in which concepts and understandings can also play a part. He desires, instead, to probe just two of the three domains of the behavioral dimension, the cognitive and the psychomotor: "A book for teachers and student teachers . . . for anyone interested in transmitting skills [psychomotor] and knowledge [cognitive] to others."[13] Purves makes eminently clear the reason Mager elects in his little treaties to avoid the affective: "This volume was developed not for the scholar but for the average teacher of vocational education so that he or she could determine precisely what it was that was desired of students."[14] We who are involved with English surely must concede that the concerns of vocational education are quite different from ours.

Before assailing Mager's first book on behavioral objectives, we should be aware, too, that it is just that—a first book on the subject, a pioneering effort already almost ten years old. In the "Foreword" of the book, John B. Gilpin leaves us with no doubts as to the intent of Mager's effort:

> *Preparing Instructional Objectives* makes a start toward describing how to specify objectives. It is not intended to be the last word on the subject. Rather, it is something like the first word.[15]

As we shall subsequently note, "B.O.'s," Mager, and others of his ilk, have come a long way since 1962.

Three: We *should not* mock "B.O." proponents unless we have good reason for doing so. They are not fools, as some in our ranks, surprised and perplexed by the arrival of "B.O.'s," would have us believe. The fact that they have mustered the support of many key public school officials certainly speaks well of their intelligence. We should note, too, that some of them—Russell W. Wiley, for instance—were at one time teachers of English and know our discipline as well as some of us do(and probably a lot better than *la trivia grammatical* does). We must concede, furthermore, as John W. Wick points out, that the goal of the "B.O." people is as intelligent as ours –because it is exactly like ours: effective teaching:

> A good teacher *wants* to bring about changes in his students.
> A good teacher is willing to tell anyone who cares to ask

> exactly which changes he is working to bring about. The idea of accountability should not be a threatening one. It simply poses a number of reasonable questions: What are my objectives? How can I reach them best? Did I reach them? The use of behaviorally stated objectives is a powerful "handle" by which teachers can answer these questions. The effort to state objectives behaviorally is *a way of thinking about the questions* which helps the teacher reach useful conclusions.[16]

Gloating over the linguistic idiosyncrasies of the "B.O." proponents is certainly no way to improve either our relations with them or our image with anybody. As Miller suggests in "The Linguistic Imagination," we who are skillful with and sensitive to language should know of better ways to employ our talents, especially "in a time of crisis such as today." Thus, when we next encounter one of our brethren gleefully throwing *sic*, complete with parentheses, after, let's say, a split infinitive created by a "B.O." authorized (and the "B.O." people are great at splitting their infinitives), hopefully each of us will have courage enough to inform our colleague that attention to such trivia is hardly admirable these days. My response will probably be in the form of a written message: "Don't you think that to really get [*sic*] his message across, the 'B.O.' authority intentionally split his infinitive? Incidentally, have you recently re-read 'Dare Schools Set a Standard in English Usage?' You could profit from another look at that fine essay by Robert C. Pooley."

Four: We *should not* assume that "both insights and attitudes appear to be omitted from treatments of behavioral objectives."[17] Such an assumption is totally unacceptable to anyone familiar with treatments which have appeared since 1962 and Mager's *Preparing Instructional Objectives*. Mager himself has been responsible for one of those treatments: *Developing Attitude Toward Learning* (Palo Alto: Fearon Publishers, Inc., 1968). Robert J. Armstrong, Terry D. Cornell, Robert E. Kraner, and E. Wayne Roberson have collaborated on another: *The Development and Evaluation of Behavioral Objectives* (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970). H. H. McAshan has produced a third: *Writing Behavioral Objectives* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970). Wiley has written two others, one untitled and unpublished, the other, *Behavioral Objectives*, also unpublished. All of these treatments of "B.O.'s" are similar in one important respect: they probe the affective domain, the domain which involves "insights and attitudes." While none of them, to my way of thinking, presents a "B.O." apparatus sophisticated enough to function effectively in that domain, all of them indicate that "B.O." proponents have improved upon *Preparing Instructional Objectives*. Collectively, furthermore, they bear witness to the indefatigability of the "B.O." people in their quest for an apparatus which operates in all three domains and whose effectiveness cannot be questioned—not even by us fishermen.

Now let's look at some positive suggestions that can lead to positive results:

One: If called upon to contribute to the manufacture of "B.O.'s," we *should* demand that all involved in our particular project agree

on meanings of key concepts. Unanimity on "cognitive," and "psychomotor" is especially essential. If we were to employ these basic terms in one way and our co-workers or superiors were to employ them in another, chaos, not progress, would result. And chaos is definitely possible given the fact that some "B.O." specialists include "evaluation," for instance, as a variable in the cognitive domain[18] while novices often see it as belonging in the affective. "Skills" is another word that must be nailed down. "B.O." specialists seem to use it freely when working with the psychomotor domain, less frequently with the cognitive, and rarely with the affective. Yet I for one cannot quite fathom their logic. In any case, slippery terminology can doubtless lead to a lot of falls for fishermen trying to stay abreast of experienced hunters.

Two: If called upon to contribute to the manufacture of "B.O.'s," we *should* demand that all involved in our particular project agree on the physical format to be used. Even a cursory glance at the writings of "B.O." specialists makes it quite clear that there is no unanimity on the shape that "B.O.'s" can take. In fact, there are almost as many formats as there are specialists, each of them reflecting the priorities and convictions of its creator.

The sample "B.O." appearing below is included for two reasons: (1) those among us who have never seen a completed "B.O." can sense what is involved in its manufacture; (2) the format that is used is as representative as most other formats—and definitely much more sensible than some which have been concocted. Hopefully, none of us will conclude that the sample depicts an ideal or perfect format. Nothing could be more absurd. An ideal or perfect format will be available only if and when all of us are involved with English agree that such a format has been created—by us and or the "B.O." authorities:

1. Tenth-grade students (institutional variable)
2. Will display an increased knowledge (behavioral variable)
3. Of semantics (instructional variable)
4. As measured by a performance of at least 70% on a teacher-created examination (method of measurement)

Three: If called upon to contribute to the manufacture of "B.O.'s," we *should* demand that all involved in our particular project agree on where "B.O.'s" can work. If it is thought that they can work in most areas of the cognitive, for example—excellent. But the areas in question from the cognitive should immediately be delineated so that no one involved with the project is subsequently in a position to proclaim: "Gee, I didn't know that "B.O.'s" had to be manufactured to cover that area. I had assumed that "B.O.'s" could work only with . . . "

As noted earlier, "B.O." enthusiasts are committed to the belief that "B.O.'s" can work in all three domains. Yet not all of them agree that every goal in every domain can be specified behaviorally.[19] Distinguishing between goals that can be identified through "B.O.'s" and those that cannot be is vital to the success of any "B.O." undertaking.

Four: If called upon to contribute to the manufacture of "B.O.'s" we *should* embark upon the venture in a spirit of cooperation. Any

other attitude makes frustration and failure inevitable, not only for us but also for all those with whom we are working.

Leaders in English have already exemplified that cooperative spirit which can and should be ours. J. N. Hook, Stephen Dunning, Edward Jenkinson, Alan, and numerous other luminaries from our ranks have been working effectively, and continue to work effectively, with Mager and other "B.O." specialists on the Tri-University BOE Project, which centers on "a two-story study of behavioral objectives for English in grades 9-12."[20]

Yet no one should delude himself. The manufacture of "B.O.'s" represents hard work for all who are engaged in it. It cannot and should not be taken lightly. But the rewards that may accrue from the strange union of the odd-looking little objects and English are too enticing for any of us to be discouraged by the possibility of hard work. More important, as Hook tells us, if those in English shy from the task of producing "B.O.'s" appropriate to their discipline, "it may be done less well by others."[21] That, in my opinion, would be the greatest fallacy to which we who are involved with the affective domain could fall victim.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Hans P. Guth, "The Monkey on the Bicycle: Behavioral Objectives and the Teaching of English," *English Journal*, LIX (September, 1970), 785-92.

[2] John Maxwell and Anthony Tovatt (eds.), "Foreword," *On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English* (Champaign: NCTE, 1970), vii-x. Cited hereafter as Maxwell, *Writing*.

[3] "On the Need for Caution in the Use of Behavioral Objectives in the Teaching of English," cited in Maxwell, *Writing*.

[4] James Moffett, "Misbehaviorist English: A Position Paper," appearing in Maxwell, *Writing*, 111-16.

[5] Don Robinson, "National Assessment Assessed: General Optimism, But Doubt Lingers On," *Phi Delta Kappan*, LII (September, 1970), 67-68.

[6] "The Magnitude of the American Educational Establishment," *Saturday Review* (September 19, 1970), 67.

[7] "Too Much Stress On College—An Official Report," *U. S. News and World Report* (undated), 45-46.

[8] "3½-Year Study Indicts Public Schools," Richmond *Times-Dispatch* (September 20, 1970), pp. 1 ff.

[9] Alan C. Purves, "Of Behaviors, Objectives, and English," *English Journal*, LIX (September, 1970), 793-97.

[10] Joseph Bondi, "Overview of EDC 401—Spring, 1970."

[11] A letter, dated September 15, 1970, from Harold H. Blanton to R. W. Reising.

[12] Richard A. Meade, "Behavioral Objectives for English?" originally presented at the VATE Supervisory Conference, September 25, 1970. Cited hereafter as Meade.

[13] Robert F. Mager, *Preparing Instructional Objectives* (Palo Alto: Fearon Publishers, Inc., 1962), cover. Cited hereafter as Mager, *Preparing*.

[14] Alan C. Purves, "'Measure what men are doing. Ian for what man might become.'" appearing in *Writing*, 87-96.

[15] John B. Gilpin, "Foreword," Mager, *Preparing*, v-vi.

[16] John W. Wick, "The What, Why, and How of Behavioral Objectives," *Procfssional Report* (New London, Connecticut: Croft Educational Services, Inc., 1970), 1-8. Cited hereafter as Wick.

[17] Meade.

[18] See, for example, *The Development and Evaluation of Behavioral Objectives*.

[19] See, for example, Wick.

[20] J. N. Hook, "The Tri-University BOE Project: A Progress Report," appearing in *Writing*, 75-86.

[21] *Ibid.*

Backlash or Backwash?

Robert T. Robertson

Department of English
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg, Virginia

Teachers of English should always be aware that their subject is a world language and a world literature. It was not always: at one time the language and its literature belonged to a small nation, and much of what we teach comes from the past and the place of that nation. But that is no longer, and most of what has happened in English and is happening today in its teaching is explained by the fact that the original family of speakers has become a very large tribe spread all over the polyglot world. The four million English-speakers of Shakespeare's day have multiplied in four centuries a hundred-fold, and less than half of them are in this country. But this is where that expansion began — in Virginia — and of all English-speakers in the world Virginians should be most conscious of that historical fact, and hence of its corollary: no development or change in the English curriculum anywhere in the English-speaking community can fail eventually to affect all other parts to greater or lesser degree.

The two major developments within the professional lifetime of most English teachers in this country and this state have been the realisation that the English language is what is spoken, not what is written; and secondly that literature in English is whatever has literary merit for the present situation of its reader. *Lorna Doone* has a certain literary value but it is not generally realised in the present situation of most readers of English — it takes contextual and comparative study to appreciate its merits. Exit *Lorna Doone* from the school English curriculum, and with her a good many other tired works; the canon of British literature on which we have blithely or blindly relied for many years has begun to evaporate.

Both developments are particularist, and they place a greater strain on the teacher of English in this country to determine for herself what is to be accepted as the English language and as literature in English. Much of that strain occurs because the walls of the classroom have thinned; the classroom is more aware of being part of a community that begins outside its door and extends across the globe. Both developments have begun to affect English teaching outside this country, as one noticed in the reports of the Dartmouth conference. In particular, the evaporation of the canon has left room

Dr. Robertson, a frequent contributor to the "Bulletin", an active member of VATE, and current president of MATE, has returned this fall to the English Department of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. He had been granted a two-year leave-of-absence to attend Queen's College in Ontario as a doctorale candidate. He is a native New Zealander, a popular speaker, and an authority on world literature.

for local writing and for writing from other parts of the English community. It is now possible to study *Huckleberry Finn* in classrooms outside this country where a few years ago it would have been sneered at, as at an even earlier date it was ignored in the English classrooms of this country.

We English teachers are now coping with a newer movement, that of writing behavioral objectives, with its concomitants of programmed learning and teacher accountability. Most English teachers raise two initial objections to this movement, as they understand it, and behind those two lies a third.

In the first place, although there has been talk about behavioral objectives in English for about six years, the idea behind it is simply the sound and traditional *modus operandi* of any classroom — the step-by-step presentation of small units or areas or problems in, say, English grammar or composition. A teacher, in this sense, is one who stands between the student and the whole subject, and pays out at the most effective rate one part of the subject after another so that the student can completely grasp each part before proceeding to the next. There is nothing novel in that.

In the second place, every English teacher knows that English is a lifetime activity, subject to attrition, growth, and stagnation throughout the student's life. Strictly speaking, then, the English teacher is accountable for her student's speaking, writing, reading and understanding until he dies. This is an extreme statement, but many senior English teachers have had the experience of former students coming back years later to see them because they remember the impress of that teacher on their habits of reading, writing, and understanding. It is not what the English teacher knows or has said or achieved that matters to the student — it is what the English teacher *is*. If she is the one who at an early age demonstrates every minute of the classroom period that she has higher standards and greater ability in speaking, writing, reading, and hearing English than anyone else the student has met up to that time, then she encourages the student to do likewise, and her model persists in his mind for a long time.

It is this human dimension of English teaching that makes it a living career and that contrasts most sharply with the mechanical premise of the behavioral objectives movement. At bottom it is a clash between modes of knowing and of learning, and, as Jacques Barzun has recently stressed in *The American University*, that clash runs through American education from top to bottom. It amounts to increasing confrontation between knowing how to do some practical ad limited task, and knowing how to learn whatever you need for your physical, mental, and spiritual comfort in life — between driver education and English. English courses are courses in pure thinking, as is recognised in their prime position in the education system from kindergarten to college.

Given this behavioral objective for English as a whole, how can we write objectives for each step of the way? Here the third objection of experienced teachers to the currently touted form of

behavioral objective writing comes into play. We have been working for years on a comprehensive and continuous curriculum in English, grades one to twelve and on up. In that curriculum, influenced as it is by the two major developments I mentioned earlier, there is very little place for what can be achieved by writing out our aims in the form of behavioral objectives, at least in their current form, and this is so for two reasons. In terms of programs and accountable objectives we cannot express our aims if those aims are defined as enabling the student to realize his own potential response to a literary work — unless we are either prepared to write objectives for every single student, or willing to return to memorizing tables of figures of speech. Furthermore the objectives cannot yet be defined and realized that will cope with the concept that the source of language is speech — unless we wish to return to the vain attempt to impose "standard" patterns of speaking and writing.

The movement for writing behavioral objectives in English, therefore, seems more reactionary than novel; the basic premise of the movement is mechanistic and inhumanistic, as was evident in the remark of a programmer that was not necessary for students to read *Walden* in order to "teach" it to them. Possibly this is part of what has been identified as a conservative trend in the United States' body politic, a reaction to the radical trend in our culture. But there is another explanation of its origins, and this we can grasp by looking at what the writing of behavioral objectives in English can achieve, its positive aspect.

Behavioral objectives do seem credible and possible in English in certain situations, chiefly wherever English is taught as a second language and especially where those being taught this second language must acquire some facility in writing an internationally comprehensible form of it. Such a situation was thought to exist in many American schools years ago and to some small extent still does, but it is found today mostly in schools which are or have lately been missionary enterprises in Africa and Asia.

About a century ago that situation pertained in the midlands and northern counties of England when Matthew Arnold was an inspector of schools. His job was to visit the school, examine each pupil and grade the teacher on the results. He loathed this inquisition as much as did the teacher and her pupils, but legislators and administrators loved it; it was called "payment by results," and the results have scarred education in the British Isles and Commonwealth for decades — as we can see in bitter scenes in Lawrence's *The Rainbow*, Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, and the novels of Sylvia Ashton-Warner.

A similar system operated in this country years ago (although the school inspector is not as well-known a figure in what may be called the race-consciousness of American teachers), and it seems to have stemmed largely from the paramount position of things New England in matters English, beginning a century ago. It was a harsh but necessary way of standardizing literacy; it did force immigrant and regional speakers to acquire a means of communication

across a continent and thus form a literate electorate; it performed much the same job in England and it has been particularly effective in providing a *lingua franca* as the base for the political, economic, and cultural hegemony of the Commonwealth of Nations. Without that system English would not today be a world language, but it is a frontier weapon, a means of extending the literacy frontier in a common language across large areas of the globe. And it still works, as I learn from my daughter who is teaching a rigid form of traditional grammar in her English classes at the girls' secondary school in Dodoma, Tanzania.

My thesis in beginning this article was that anything that works in one part of English-speaking world will gradually permeate the others — a "ripple" theory, let us call it. The two developments I described earlier seem to me to have begun to ripple out from this country into those other parts; in turn they have provoked a counter-ripple back from its frontiers to the center.

The movement for the writing of behavioral objectives in English is such a counter-ripple, I suggest, and we have seen these reverse movements before. When universal education was introduced into England in the late nineteenth century it caused an educational crisis, especially a shortage of teachers which was solved temporarily by the introduction from mission schools in India of what was called the "Calcutta System": each teacher taught ten pupils who in turn taught ten more; the system is still used in mass literacy programs, methods which have been superseded in a literate area but which has severe limitations. In times of crisis, then, the cruder still operate on its frontier are likely to be brought back to the center of the area as remedies for the crisis.

Now I am not suggesting that we are in a crisis in English education in this country; but for some reason or other we are being invited to consider seriously the writing of behavioral objectives in English, and that idea is, I suggest, to be found at work only on the literacy frontier of English at present. But it did at one time play a part in the education system in this country. Rather than being a direct importation from, say, Tanzania of an out-moded system, it is probably not so much a counter-ripple as a subterranean swell, the memory of a harsh frontier past when those who paid the country school teacher passed judgement on his or her ability. After all, there is no simpler accountability test than a good old-fashioned spelling-bee. Whatever its source — an importation or a revival — the idea of writing behavioral objectives in English directly conflicts with our new and hard-won particularist values.

Writing objectives in English is not so much an alternative to present practices as a conflict with them for a much deeper reason than I have so far suggested. Objectives must be expressed in a linear mode, a step-by-step sequence in which each step is self-contained and likely to be forgotten when tested. As a linear mode of learning it conflicts with what may be called a "layer" mode in which everything that is learned settles down at is appropriate level in the human consciousness. If there is a spiritual crisis in America, part of

it may be caused by the realisation that for too long we have assumed that everything worth knowing can be presented in assembly line or conveyor belt fashion; we are beginning to realize that there is a difference between driver education and English, and that what works for one — the linear mode — will not work for the other. English, as the portal to all learning and the means of all thinking, settles down at the deepest level of consciousness, and the basic assumption of every Englih teacher must be that she is both building on what the student's previous teacher gave him and also putting down a layer for the next.

Such a grand objective amounts to releasing the consciousness of the student from ignorance not just of English but of everything worth knowing. In both its depth and its long lifetime effect on the student, English is incapable of defining its objectives except in the humanistic terms it has always employed, and these may appear meaningless to the programmer. The validity or eternal truth of those terms resides in the ethic of the individual English teacher. We should, therefore, welcome the challenge of the behaviorists as an opportunity to revitalize our ethic and as a moment to educate them in a restatement of our objectives in the most valid and real humanistic terms. We might, for instance, ask of any behavioral objective program: does it make the student happier in the English classroom, or does it make him a better human being? We should certainly demand that those humanist criteria be taken into account in writing such a program, and I know we would all be interested in how it could be done.

What possibly inhibits us in challenging the behaviorists is that the sense of the tradition of teaching English is not nearly as firmly felt in this country as in other parts of the English-speaking world; it seems to have been vitiated by all sorts of assaults on our integrity and competence in the last two decades. But we can recover that pride in our tradition by accepting this challenge. Our first step should be to recognize the real nature of this new movement for writing behavioral objectives, and to demand that it deny the imputations I have made — that is it inherently mechanistic, simplistic, reactionary and imperialistic. The awareness of the English teacher that he or she is not alone, that English is a world language and a world literature, enables us to recognize the familiar nature of this movement, an old enemy writ new.

THREE BULLETIN WRITERS HONORED

Articles written by R. Baird Shuman, Henry L. Sublett, and Donald Ball for the May, 1970 issue of the *Bulletin* are considered by NCTE / ERIC to be substantive contributions to education and abstracts of their articles will appear in a spring issue of *Research in Education.*

Accountability for Achievement in English?

Robert P. Hilldrup

Director of Public Information
Richmond Public Schools
Richmond Virginia

In a mid-western city, a private firm of educational consultants takes over operation of an entire public school, agreeing to forfeit a set part of its fee for each pupil whose performance in certain ademic areas does not improve to a pre-set level.[1]

In many northern cities, demands from citizens result in public disclosure of comparative school scores on standardized tests taken by pupils.[2]

At major educational meetings, the issue of testing for a national assessment of public educational performance remains an issue of heated controversy.[3]

Can one word sum up all three trends?

Yes—Accountability

Like the cost of everything else, the cost of public education continues to rise. With the oft-rumored "taxpayer's revolt" now a reality in many areas, this public clamor for accountability in educational progress frequently becomes a demand for a report—in layman's language—of what taxpayers are getting for their money in the way of pupil progress and performance.

But can such accountability be furnished and, particularly, can it be furnished in the broad general area of English, one in which subjective achievement is frequent and, accordingly, difficult to measure? Perhaps, but it is by no means easy.

Before joining the Richmond Public Schools in 1969 as Director of Public Information, Mr. Hilldrop was education editor of "The Richmond News Leader". He holds an A.B. in English from East Carolina University and an M.Ed. from Virginia Commonwealth University. He has taught in the public schools, in adult education, on educational television and at the university level.

Measuring achievement—accountability—is difficult, if not impossible, when results are so often deferred. The teacher who can implant ideas and values like "time bombs . . that . . (have) been going off ever since"[4] has been just as "accountable" as one whose charges score well on the weekly test and then live on with unchanged lives.

To say that accountability is not already with us is to ignore the obvious. For example, despite all efforts to the contrary, many citizens insist on taking satisfaction in the excellence of a school which produces a handful of Merit Scholars, looking with jaundiced eye at the neighboring school which has none.

The business executive who must teach basic grammar to a new secretary has his "accountability" and, at times, a negative one. But is it fair to say that the secretary knows less than one from a previous generation?

The colleges and universities which must offer remedial classes in basic composition may snarl at the incompetency of the public schools, but to what extent do minority quotas and open enrollment bear on the problem?

The drop-out rate is a matter of legitimate concern, but the simple facts are that, overall, more students are staying in school longer, despite academic weakness, which in other eras would have forced them out into the unskilled labor force. How does this retention factor reduce raw objective test scores from the level of previous years?

The case for public agitation over the accountability issue has already been stated in broad terms. What, then, are some of the critical factors under which English teachers must work which may be contributory to the problem, what are some possible solutions, and how is this entire area best presented to the public recognizing both the Layman's right to accountability and the professional's right to oft-times subjective judgments?

Some of the critical factors under which English teachers must work are:

1. Time. No matter how one cuts it, there are still only 24 hours in a day. Enrichment programs and summer courses may help, but the actual length of the school day is little changed from 20 or even 40 years ago—and the amount of quantitative subject matter which the schools are expected to transmit has increased hideously in the same period.

2. Student load. It may be redundant, but an English teacher simply cannot handle the pupil load, with its concommitant burden of essays, speeches, book reports, and other time-consuming projects that can be undertaken, for example, by a teacher of home economics or other specialities.

3. Objectives. The aims of education were outlined many years ago with some rhetoric by Alfred North Whitehead.[5] They have been summarized more recently and in an entirely different kind of language by Max Rafferty.[6] Regardless of these philosophical extremes, or dozens of others in between, it seems that a great deal of confusion still exists among teachers—to say nothing of pupils and parents—as to just what are the objectives of the English curriculum. At present, one suspects countless English teachers are floundering in the morass of spelling vs. Silas Marner, voice and diction vs. an exercise in parsing.

Thus, English educators can hardly account to the public on what they are achieving and where they are going if, indeed, more than a few are less than certain themselves.

4. Competence. Call it a value judgment (which it is), but subjective observation leaves one with the painful feeling that too many ill-prepared, uninterested (and uninteresting) people are

teaching the grand old subject of English. Too many have themselves never developed any true love or feeling for language. They are prone to pontification, lovingly describing, as James Jackson Kilpatrick observed, four bananas as "three bananas and one enlongated yellow fruit"[7] instead of simply, four bananas.

It should be impossible to visit an English teacher's home or office without finding books on table, in chairs, under the bed, a library that is used, picked and gleaned, polished and rubbed, to produce the enthusiasm and excitement that leaves the teacher aghast that time has expired and a new play, an old poem, a long lost novel, has not been thrown out for dissection and digestion by his pupils.

In truth, how many English teachers are *themselves* accountable —sticking to the state-approved text and the minimum certification requirements, or reading, debating, thinking, exploring, stretching the boundaries of their own interests, their own minds, so that at the right moment they will stand ready to strike the spark of literary emotion to the tinder of the student heart?

How many white teachers have read the authors of the black anger? And how many black teachers have sought, truly, to understand the traditional white culture amidst which the child of poverty, the ghetto, or the minority must make his place if he is to live and work with success and profit in the society of America and the world?

And, so, what can be done?

Many things.

1. Let's get off the defensive about accountability. To do this, we must say to all—professional and layman—that there are some areas in which an objective accounting of English achievement is possible: measurements of traditional grammatical knowledge, reading levels, spelling skills but that these are incidental to the overall objective which is:

2. Communications. This is what English teaching should be all about. The accountability thus must be measured from a simple, yet subjective standpoint: has this child grown—is he continuing to grow—in his communicative skills? Does he read; not necessarily what, but how much? Can he articulate his ideas, not just to his peers, but to those at other social levels? Does he write; not necessarily some copy-book exercise, but with an expressive emotion which lets the reader know what the child knows, what the child feels? Does he hear—and understand? In short, has he been equipped to feel that he can express himself through language, rather than violence? Can he receive facts, ideas, emotions, through the spoken word? What does he think? Why? If children can be equipped to do these things, then those whose job it is to teach English have been accountable.

And yet—all this is very nice, but how can it be accomplished?

3. Cooperative efforts, among which are a return to the core curriculum at the elementary level.

The core curriculum of 35 years ago was criticized, perhaps rightly, not because the concept is inadequate, but that the emphasis was wrong. Consider for a moment what might be achieved by implementing a communication-language centered core of study in

which all disciplines were taught with primary emphasis on language and communication.

The mechanics of this are far too involved to cover here, but suffice it to say that considerable restructuring of the training of elementary teachers is required.

Secondly, there should be further internal communication in which secondary teachers let elementary teachers know—directly—how it seems that elementary language training has fallen short. Elementary teachers, in turn, should be able to let secondary teachers know something of the awesome difficulty of preparing large numbers of very young children amidst the often frightening workloads under which elementary teachers must live and labor.

Thirdly, the secondary curriculum must be so structured that teachers of all disciplines will recognize their responsibility for accountability in language. It does no good for an English teacher to strive for vivid and correct expression in writing, speaking, or discussion if the biology teacher across the hall is permitting language errors to go uncorrected and unchallenged. Nor, it might be noted, is the cause of education advanced when the English teacher checks a report only for grammar, style and structure and ignores the accuracy of historical or scientific fact which the report may contain.

4. Liberate the curriculum. No teacher can—or should—attempt to pound into the heads of children everything they need to know about language or anything else. But to do otherwise requires that the English teacher present a buffet of choices, rather than a meal from a single text. The entire scope of resources, plays, movies, TV, paperbacks particularly, newspapers, including the underground press, public speaking, debate, book reviews, (God save us from book *reports*) should be the menu.

Having done these things, having first taken a hard look at our own accountability, our own shortcomings in knowledge, preparation, curriculum and personal resources, we can then say with confidence that we are ready to testify to the accountability of pupils, with objective data when possible, secure however in the knowledge that, for each child and teacher, the ultimate accountabilities can be found only "in the small one country of the spirit, ditched across the heart in tender pain and there they stay, forever barricade against invasion."[8]

A NOTE ON SOURCES

[1] "Performance Contracts Catch On," *Nation's Schools*, Vol. 86, No. 2, August, 1970, p. 32.

[2] *New York Times*, February 15, 1970, p. 64.

[3] "What's The Score on National Assessment?", by G. B. Brown, *CTA Journal*, May, 1969, p. 3.

[4] Seymour St. John, headmaster of Choate School, as quoted by Peter S. Prescott in *A World of Our Own*, Coward-McCann, Inc., New York, 1970, p. 79.

[5] *The Aims of Education*, by Alfred North Whitehead, The Macmillan Co., 1929. The aims stated herein aren't easy to understand and must be considered somewhat dated. Two far more relevant books, which should be required reading before any teacher starts on his own goals, are by Gilbert Highet: *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, Columbia University Press, 1954, 138 pages and *The Art of Teaching*, Vintage Books, 1959, 259 pages. If these don't turn you on about teaching, you might want to consider another profession.

[6] Two of Dr. Rafferty's books, *Suffer Little Children*, The Devin-Adair Co., 1962, or *What They Are Doing to Your Children*, The New American Library, 1963, describe Rafferty's simplified but delightful theories of education. His style of writing may yet slay the dragon of the educational pedagogues which, come to think of it, may be an act of high achievement and one which English teachers, particularly, should applaud, regardless of his philosophy.

[7] These comments were among a series of observations delivered by Kilpo during a visit to Sweet Briar College in 1967. Those who worked with him at the Richmond News Leader before he became a syndicated columnist considered his prose the best in journalism.

[8] *Not So Wild A Dream*, by Eric Sevareid, Alfred A. Knopf, 1946, p. 483. Those who have grown tired of Sevaried's television pontificating should realize that he wasn't always this way.